REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-26. Claims 1, 10, 19 and 24-26 are amended herein, and new claim 27 is added. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: U.S. Patent No. 5,810,605 (Siefert), U.S. Patent No. 5,122,952 (Minkus), U.S. Patent No. 6,206,700 (Brown) and "Integrating Models of Personality and Emotions into Lifelike Characters" (Andre).

Siefert generates profiles for selecting a material to be presented to a student during each session (see, column 3, lines 10-13, and column 3, lines 26-30), and periodically modifies the profiles based upon assessment of the student's performance (i.e., student's mastery of a lesson) (see, FIG. 2, abstract, and column 4, lines 5-7). That is, Siefert is limited to assessing a student's mastery of a presented education program and subsequently updating how the program is presented in the future.

Minkus evaluates commercially available products (i.e., toys, learning materials, etc.) to characterize the products on a product evaluation form (see, column 4, lines 1-11). For example, a questionnaire having questions concerning personal information is presented to an individual (see, column 15, lines 30-37 and column 16, line 65 through column 17, line 4) and the information gathered based on the responses is used to match the individual to the characterized products (see, column 38, lines 53-57).

Brown is directed to an interactive adaptive learning system according to which a user's actions and responses in reaction to a stimuli are recorded and analyzed based not only on the success rate of the user responses, but also on other characteristics of the user's reaction to the stimuli (see, Abstract and column 9, lines 15-23). That is, the user's learning strategy is classified and this classification is then utilized to either allow the learning strategy to continue as initially set, or to find the presently indicated level of difficulty for the user or to adapt to the user's learning strategies or needs (see, column 9, lines 23-31).

Andre discusses developing variations of an agent's behavioral reactions to a user's behavioral actions, where the agent's behavior is planned and affected by percepts and events and user input (see, page 3-4, The Role of Affect in Puppet). Then, the agent responds to a

plurality of users, and changes its behavioral reactions according to the users' actions and behaviors. In Andre, the agent's reactions are predefined to respond to different users' actions, and an agent is caused to respond to different user's actions (see, page 5, last paragraph). That is, the agent's behavioral reaction to user's behavior is predefined in the development and not dynamically modified in accordance with user's behavior in response to agent's behavior.

The present invention determines a trait of a user based on magnitudes in a plurality of scales associated with learning behavior of the user and a teaching material presentation pattern for the user is determined in accordance with the determined trait. The learning behavior of the user is analyzed during a learning process of the user in accordance with the teaching material presentation pattern, and the teaching material presentation pattern is dynamically modified based on trait and the learning behavior of the user.

Independent claims 1, 10, 19 and 24-26 as amended recite that the present invention determines a trait of a user related to personality "in accordance with magnitudes in a plurality of scales associated with learning behavior of said user" and "dynamically" modifies the teaching material presentation pattern ("teaching materials are dynamically modified" in claim 24). For example, learning behavior of user A is monitored during a learning process conducted using a teaching material presentation pattern and the teaching material presentation pattern is adjusted while the user A is participating in the learning process.

It is submitted that the independent claims 1, 10, 19 and 24-26 are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from independent claims 1, 10 and 19 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claims 5 and 14, "said questionnaire comprises first and second portions, and said second portion of said questionnaire is determined depending on an answer to said first portion of said questionnaire, and is provided after said first portion of said questionnaire is provided".

The cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest analyzing an answer to a questionnaire to determine a trait of a user, where "said questionnaire comprises first and second portions, and said second portion of said questionnaire is determined depending on an answer to said first portion of said questionnaire, and is provided after said first portion of said questionnaire is provided", as recited in claims 5 and 14.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 27 has been added to recite, "providing a teaching material having a first content to the user based on traits of the user, the traits being assigned a numerical value based on responses to a questionnaire provided to the user", "analyzing learning behavior of the user while the teaching material having the first content is being provided to the user" and "dynamically changing the teaching material presentation pattern based on the analysis to generate a teaching material having a second content".

Siefert, Minkus, Brown and/or Andre, do not teach or suggest "providing a teaching material having a first content", "analyzing learning behavior of the user while the teaching material having the first content is being provided to the user" and "dynamically changing the teaching material presentation pattern based on the analysis to generate a teaching material having a second content", as recited in claim 27.

It is submitted that new claim 27 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8/2/5

By: _____

J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501